

University of Northern Iowa UNI ScholarWorks

Faculty Senate Documents

Faculty Senate

2-22-1982

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 22, 1982

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright © 1982 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, February 22, 1982" (1982). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 376.

http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/376

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Gerald L Peterson
Senate Library
February 22, 1982
1295

1. Remarks from Vice President and Provost Martin.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

2. Approved motion to modify procedures for EOP evaluation team selection.

CALENDAR

3. 312 Approved motion to docket an application for emeritus status for the next Senate meeting. Docket 254.

DOCKET

4. 310 252 Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Status. (See Senate Minutes 1293 and 1294.) Discussion on the Report as amended will continue at the next Senate meeting.

The University Faculty Senate was called to order at 4:01 p.m., February 22, 1982, in the Board Room by Chairperson Davis.

Present: Abel, Baum, Cawelti, Davis, J. Duea, Erickson, Glenn, Hallberg, Heller, Millar, Noack, Remington, Sandstrom, Story, TePaske, Yager (ex officio)

Alternates: Schwandt for Cooney, Diamond for Hollman, Rider for Richter

Absent: J. Alberts

Members of the press were requested to identify themselves. Mr. Jeff Moravec of the Cedar Falls Record, and Al Schares and Cathy Hite of the Northern Iowan, were in attendance.

1. Vice President and Provost Martin addressed the Senate. Dr. Martin indicated that the University was extremely pleased by the ten-year accreditation granted by the North Central Association. Dr. Martin stated that the University thought that they might be awarded a shorter term because of the relatively new Doctorate of Industrial Technology. Dr. Martin indicated that it was quite normal for institutions who do not have several doctoral programs to be limited to the actual programs offered. He indicated if the University would offer an additional doctoral program, then a focused visit would be conducted by the North Central Association.

Dr. Martin indicated that an outside auditor (Reese & Company) had been selected and approved by the State Auditor's Office for the EOP audit. He indicated this firm will start their task in the near future.

Dr. Martin indicated the Academic Planning Report will be going to the Board of Regents in the near future. He indicated there will be a planning seminar with the Board held on April 21, and that the Faculty Senators will receive a copy of that report.

Dr. Martin indicated that he was proud to announce that Dr. Paul Rider had agreed to serve as the facilitator for the EOP evaluation. He indicated that Dr. Rider would be granted released time to accomplish this task.

Senator Remington questioned Dr. Martin concerning the radio and television reports of a DCI agent being on campus. Dr. Martin responded by stating that an agent had been on campus in relationship to the EOP audit. Dr. Martin indicated that this evidently is customary procedure for the DCI, should an audit reveal major irregularities.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

2. Dean Hansen addressed the Senate in relationship to the EOP evaluation process. Dean Hansen indicated that the nominations are in and have been sent out pursuant to the prescribed deletion process. He stated that 61 people had been nominated. He reported that 24 people have deletion privileges. He stated that three lists have been returned, and of the 61 nominees--59 names have been rejected. He stated it was likely all names would be rejected once each of the returns are received. He indicated that no guidelines for deletion were given, nor were reasons for deletion secured. He sought the Senate's guidance as to how to proceed with this matter.

Senator Sandstrom asked Dean Hansen to describe the quality of the candidates as he perceived them. Dean Hansen indicated most candidates seemed to be highly qualified. He indicated that a list of ten to twelve people may be needed to be able to find three people who are willing and able to serve on the evaluation team.

Senator Hallberg pointed out that the motion stated people should suggest deletions and that absolute deletion power was not suggested.

Professor Skaine suggested sending the lists out again and indicating to the recipients that they could not strike more than a certain number of names.

Dean Hansen pointed out that 19 members of the EOP staff have received the list.

Senator Story suggested that perhaps EOP collectively could be granted one vote. Senator Sandstrom indicated that the staff may be large enough to not be of one voice and that he felt their input was important.

Senator Yager indicated perhaps we should say that the groups can only cut so many from the list and that after the lists have been returned, people would be placed in ranked order based on the fewest number of strikes against them. Senator Remington suggested that EOP be considered one unit and that the 19 individuals should be allowed to come up with one completed list. He also suggested that no one group should be allowed to strike more than 25 percent of the names from the list.

Remington moved, Sandstrom seconded, that the Senate adopt a procedure by which the EOP staff, as an entity, is to be considered one of the persons or groups making deletions and that no one entity may strike more than 25 percent of the names from the list.

The four deleting groups were identified as follows: 1) President Kamerick and Vice President and Provost Martin; 2) Chairperson of the Faculty Senate Davis; 3) UNISA President Martin; and 4) EOP staff.

Question on the motion was called. Motion passed.

CALENDAR

3. The Chair asked permission to docket an application for emeritus status for the next regular Senate meeting. The Senate approved. Docket 254.

DOCKET

4. 310 252 Report of ad hoc Committee on Faculty Status. (See Senate Minutes 1293 and 1294.)

Senator Sandstrom indicated that the definition of the faculty is not restricted by the master contract. He pointed out that the Faculty Constitution is not an official document since it has not been approved by the Board of Regents. He stated the Senate should consider grandfathering those individuals who previously were granted faculty status. He stated the most important item was first to define the faculty. He indicated there were two ways the faculty could be defined:

1. Define by function. He indicated that classroom teachers and researchers would possibly be included in this group.
2. Define by rank--those holding academic rank in individual departments.

Sandstrom moved, Cawelti seconded, to adopt the definition: "A faculty member is one who teaches at least one course per calendar year."

Senator Heller inquired as to how the Roster could be determined in October in relationship to appointments that would be affective in the spring. Senator Sandstrom indicated that if the person had not previously taught then he/she would not be counted. He indicated he would suggest a June 1 certification date.

Senator Duea inquired if a guest lecturer or instructor would be considered a member of the faculty if he/she taught one course during the year. Senator Sandstrom indicated that the person's name could be removed if the individual was not to be employed by the University for future terms. Senator Schwandt inquired if adjunct professors would be included. Senator Sandstrom responded in the affirmative and stated that such individuals would probably be included in the non-voting faculty group. Senator Remington asked if this motion would exclude people returning from one-year PDL's. Senator Sandstrom indicated that this was not his intent. He indicated he was trying to set a functional definition which could be refined at a later date. Professor Murray Austin indicated that it would be possible to indicate by the wording that it would be an expectation that the person would teach one course in the year.

Senator Duea stated she was concerned that people holding grants and projects would not be considered members of the faculty. She indicated that this action would perhaps discourage individuals from applying for grants and projects.

Vice President Martin stated that he felt the word "faculty" was used if a process was implied in which the person had been selected or appointed.

Professor Skaine stated he felt additional criteria were needed. He pointed out that graduate students, professional and scientific employees, etc., who taught one course, would fulfill the criteria as suggested. Senator Story indicated that it might be wise to add to the definition probationary or tenured appointment characteristics.

Senator Sandstrom inquired of Professor Skaine if he favored the definition based on rank. Professor Skaine indicated he felt that it was better but that he still had concerns for some people, such as those in Advising and Counseling, who he thought merited consideration.

Senator Hallberg stated that he favored a functional definition but did not feel that the one proposed met those characteristics. He stated the previous question was on people who have strong impact on the academic life of the University. He stated that he was in favor of adding such people to the faculty unit. He stated he felt the situation of grandfathering in borderline cases could be dealt with by the proposed Heller amendment.

Senator Abel stated that she must speak against the motion, stating that, while teaching is central to the University, the components of research and public service are also very important.

Senator Yager indicated that, in regard to titles, people who would have academic rank as defined in the Rider proposal, excluded adjuncts. Vice President Martin indicated that individuals could be adjunct professors but could not, under that characteristic, be on probationary or tenure-track appointments.

Senator Sandstrom reported on the survey that he had conducted among his colleagues in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. This survey dealt with the definition of who should be considered faculty.

- 1) Should administrators be included? Response: 87% no.
- 2) Advising and Counseling? Response: 89% no.
- 3) Librarians? Response: 81% no.
- 4) Lab School faculty? Response: 85% no.
- 5) Should a rank definition be used? Response: 56% yes.
- 6) Should voting rights be granted to temporary faculty? Response: 57% no.
- 7) Should voting rights be granted to adjunct faculty? Response: 91% no.
- 8) Should voting rights be granted to part-time faculty? Response: 57% no.

Senator Sandstrom indicated that his colleagues felt that the voting faculty were those permanent tenure-track people on the faculty.

Senator Hallberg indicated he was not surprised by the outcome. He indicated it was likely that classroom teachers would want full-time teaching tenure-track characteristics as a definition. He indicated he was not sure if the survey was well-founded or if it represented a particular interest group.

Professor Murray Austin inquired as to the purpose of identifying the definition of faculty. He indicated that faculty meetings had always been open for input. He stated that the definition was needed for that subset of individuals who represent the primary function of the University.

Senator Duea indicated that item 4 of the Sandstrom survey has not been part of the previous discussion of this item and indicated that some people would be greatly concerned by its inclusion in that survey instrument.

Question on the motion to amend was called. Motion defeated.

Heller moved, Hallberg seconded, to amend by adding Section 1.4 to the document.

- 1.4 University personnel not classified as a voting faculty member by this definition of the faculty but who wish to be considered a voting faculty member, after filing a written request, be considered for such status by the Faculty Senate. Voting faculty status, thus acquired, shall be retained by that faculty member only so long as he/she remains in his/her present position.

Senator Heller indicated that his idea was related to the position versus the individual.

Senator Story indicated she was concerned that no criteria had been suggested. Senator Heller indicated that that was the responsibility of the Faculty Senate to create. Senator Abel inquired if the Senate really wished to consider each of these individual requests or if they would be interested in the appointment of an ad hoc committee. The Chair indicated the Senate could appoint a recommending committee which would bring recommended applications to the Senate.

Senator Remington inquired if these people would be considered part of an academic unit. Senator Heller indicated that these people would be considered members of the voting faculty and would need to be attached to some constituency.

Senator Remington posed a hypothetical question, asking if the individual applied and the status was granted, and if the individual was assigned to a department or college, what the response would be if that group objected to the attachment. Senator Abel indicated that at the time of recommendation the potentially assigned groups would be notified, and their approval would be required.

Professor Rider indicated that, currently, the Chairperson of the Faculty, based on the Faculty Constitution, has the role of determining the Faculty Roster, and that therefore a mechanism is currently in place that covers this situation.

Professor Skaine encouraged people to consider that certain people may be included based on their function. He encouraged a look at the Master Agreement on the definition of who was in the bargaining unit. He inquired if the people in the amendment would be assigned to units including the non-instructional unit or would they be assigned to specific academic units, such as the College of Education. He pointed out that under this proposal the Senate would lose the two non-instructional Senate positions.

Chairperson of the Faculty Yager indicated she felt the Senate was skirting the issue and pointed out that there were 22 categories in which people are now classified as non-instructional faculty. She asked if the Senate would wish to look at these 22 categories and determine if there existed potential alignments to warrant inclusion in the voting faculty.

Vice President Martin indicated that, while the amendment has grace and function, his office is sensitive to maintaining the integrity of the appointment process. He indicated that it would be a tragedy for some individual to be appointed to an instructional unit when he/she really does not have the credentials to teach in that academic unit.

Senator Sandstrom directed a question to Dr. Martin inquiring if non-instructional would be included in his definition of faculty by rank. Vice President Martin indicated that holding rank in a department is certainly a definition of faculty, and that it is a core from which the Senate can expand.

Professor Judith Harrington indicated that the Policies and Procedures manual contains a definition of faculty which is clear and would define the needed characteristics.

Senator Abel indicated that she found it difficult to look at such positions as registrar, which works closely with the faculty in academic matters, as not being eligible for faculty status. She pointed out that such positions are often asked to work on faculty committees dealing with instructional matters. She stated she felt that both the qualifications of the individual and the position that he/she held were important in these considerations. Professor Austin indicated that voting privileges are generally a matter of jurisdiction. He indicated he did not believe that those individuals who might be involved with the mechanical process need necessarily be included in the faculty group.

Senator Heller pointed out that his amendment dealt with those individuals who wished to apply for voting designation versus the previous example of where the Faculty Chair would have to look at all people who might be potentially eligible. Professor Rider indicated that the Chairperson of the Faculty confers faculty status and stated he felt the Heller amendment tended to add a layer of duplication.

Chairperson of the Faculty Yager indicated this problem was greater up until approximately five or six years ago when the Chairpersons of the Faculty decided to look at appointment letters to see if faculty status had been conferred. She stated that in the last four years decisions have been made based on confirmation in appointment letters. She indicated the problem was not as great as it had been in the past and stated that it was very important to protect the appointment process.

Senator Remington stated that he had originally favored this amendment but now he believed he opposed it based on the fact that potential P & S employees could be assigned to faculty departments and questioned as to the impact their vote might have in curricular matters and in such matters dealing with the PAC.

Senator Hallberg stated that there was not a great area of indecision to solve. He stated that actions have been taken by precedent before and that our present practice is perfectly satisfactory.

Chairperson of the Faculty Yager indicated she approved of looking at the 22 categories and deciding who the Senate believed should be included in the faculty and grandfathering positions on the basis of appointment letters. She stated she believed that many of those people in the 22 categories should not be considered members of the faculty based on Faculty Senate action.

Professor Skaine stated that he felt that the past practice had not worked all that well, particularly in relationship to the faculty being able to garner quorums at meetings. He stated that perhaps we should look at what the faculty is supposed to do: 1) Is it to be a governance voice for a segment of the University; or 2) Is it to be broader, to include all factors.

Senator Heller indicated that his amendment called for allowing voting faculty members, not just faculty members, and that his amendment called for approval by position.

Vice President Martin indicated that we can determine rank but not necessarily faculty status. He indicated the amendment does not appoint to rank within departments.

Professor Rider indicated that the same procedure on voting could be handled by the Chairperson of the Faculty. Senator Story pointed out that Heller's amendment allows for exceptions to the criteria stated. Senator Hallberg indicated that criteria were not needed, but judgment based on history was what was important.

Senator Cawelti inquired if it was the position that deserved faculty status or the person who deserved it. Senator Story indicated it was the qualifications of the person and the position.

Senator Heller pointed out the Chairperson of the Faculty would have to make selections based on the criteria identified in Sections 1.1 and 1.2.

Remington moved, Story seconded, to amend the amendment by deleting the first two words "University personnel" and substituting them with "A member of the University faculty."

Senator Remington indicated that he hoped this will clarify Senator Hallberg's position and make the Heller amendment more restrictive. This would therefore make the option of applying available only to those who carry faculty status.

Senator Sandstrom suggested that grandfathering not be automatic, and encouraged a review by position.

Senator Remington indicated that the amendment applies to those who have non-voting status and who would be allowed to apply for voting status, and indicated that if a position had not been grandfathered, that position would have no chance of being selected for the voting faculty.

Question on the motion to amend the amendment was called. Motion to amend the amendment passed.

Professor Rider encouraged the Senate to let the Faculty Chair act, but to give the Faculty Chair a better definition from which to make decisions. Senator Remington indicated the advantage of the Heller amendment--that it does avoid hurt feelings and that it means that the number of boundary cases would be reduced dramatically. Senator Hallberg indicated that he trusted the Chair of the Faculty, based on past precedence, to make decisions in this area. He stated that a problem that needed to be solved did not exist.

Professor Skaine indicated the amendment has a good chance to allow for more representative constituent review.

Senator Heller pointed out that the amendment does not stand if the Rider proposal is defeated.

Question on the Heller amendment as amended was called. The amendment as amended passed.

Senator Hallberg stated the remaining question was whether the Senate wished to grandfather voting as well as non-voting, and he suggested that the Senate address this question at its next meeting.

Hallberg moved, Cawelti seconded, to adjourn. Motion passed.

The Senate adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

The next meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held at 3:15 p.m. on March 22, 1982.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip L. Patton, Secretary

These minutes shall stand approved as published unless corrections or protests are filed with the Secretary of the Senate within two weeks of this date, Wednesday, March 10, 1982.